



**Environmental Management &
Stewardship Committee and Budget & Process
Combined Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 19, 6 p.m.
DOE Information Center
Office of Science and Technical Information**

Committee Members Present

Alfreda Cook
Carmen DeLong
Bob Hatcher, Co-Chair, EM &
Stewardship Committee
Dave Hemelright
Bruce Hicks
Jennifer Kasten
Donald Mei
Greg Paulus, Chair, Budget &
Process Committee
Lorene Sigal
Ellen Smith
Corkie Staley, Co-Chair, EM &
Stewardship Committee
Curt Walker

Others Present

Dave Adler, Department of Energy (DOE)
Sid Garland, UCOR/RSI
Luther Gibson
Spencer Gross, ORSSAB staff

Absent

Jimmy Bell
Dale Bignell
Donna Campbell
Susan Gawarecki
Gracie Hall
Steve Kenworthy
Dick Ketelle
Roger Macklin
David Martin
Fay Martin
Gloria Mei
Lance Mezga
Norman Mulvenon
Bob Olson
Belinda Price
Julia Riley
Ray Smith
Wanda Smith

Consider Recommendation on FY 2016 DOE Oak Ridge EM Budget Request

The ORSSAB Environmental Management (EM) & Stewardship Committee and the Budget & Process Committee held a combined meeting to begin formulating a draft recommendation on the DOE Oak Ridge EM FY 2016 budget request.

Mr. Adler said DOE is always interested in receiving input from the board on budget requests. He said DOE looks to ORSSAB for input on whether DOE's priorities for cleanup are on track or if the board has other ideas for cleanup priorities.

He explained that ORSSAB's input will be included with Environmental Protection Agency and Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation input when DOE Oak Ridge EM sends it budget request to DOE Headquarters in the April/May timeframe.

Mr. Adler showed a timeline chart of cleanup activities and the estimated amounts of money needed to finish the projects within the timeline (Attachment 1). Projects between FY 2014 and 2016 are near-term projects that include completion of cleanup at East Tennessee Technology Park (ETTP), disposition of uranium-233 from Oak Ridge National Lab (ORNL), continued processing and disposition of transuranic (TRU) waste, and the design and construction of a mercury treatment plant at Y-12 National Security Complex.

Other near-term costs are base operating expenses like security, maintenance, landfill operations, and operating the waste water treatment plant.

Mid-term priorities focus on building demolition and mercury cleanup at Y-12 and long-term activities focus on ORNL cleanup.

Mr. Adler said ETTP, U-233, and TRU waste projects are near-term because they are higher hazard projects and finishing them first would free up money for other projects and make ETTP completely available for reindustrialization.

But there are more projects than there have been appropriations to finish the work within the timeline. The chart assumes more money than has been received in recent years. As a result some projects will have to be pushed more into the future. He said any ideas from the board would be welcome.

Mr. Hemelright said if problems at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP, where TRU waste is sent for disposal) turn out to be long-term, then TRU waste disposition would have to be moved into the future (a fire and radiation release at WIPP in February closed the facility temporarily). Mr. Adler said while waste couldn't be shipped to WIPP now, there is productive work that can be done with TRU in Oak Ridge and the material could be stored safely for a while.

Mr. Hicks asked where groundwater was on the chart. Mr. Adler said it was included in base operations. He said the cost is low enough that it was not highlighted. If groundwater projects were cut it would present few problems, he said. If a decision is made to remediate groundwater that would be a long-term priority.

Ms. Smith said the base operations cost appears large and grows over time. She thought it would be helpful to pull project costs out so it doesn't look like base costs grow over time.

Ms. DeLong asked what the lifespan of the TRU Waste Processing Center is. Mr. Adler said the facility is set up to handle all legacy waste and near-term waste. Studies are underway to predict future waste generation. He said any future TRU waste from ORNL would be small and a different type of plant might be needed.

Mr. Paulus said mercury in East Fork Poplar Creek and under buildings at Y-12 is not an imminent threat. He thought delaying mercury mitigation would be a possibility if appropriations are not sufficient. However, Mr. Hicks thought mercury should remain a high priority, because it would have congressional support.

Ms. Smith said the future of ETTP is not completely tied to cleanup and there are no large risks, like TRU or U-233. She said if work was slowed at ETTP it would take pressure off of the EM Waste Management Facility and delay the need to build a second disposal facility. Mr. Adler said there are both high-risk and low-risk facilities at ETTP. The gaseous diffusion building K-27 is a high-risk building. But leaving low-risk buildings in place carries mortgage costs. He said K-31 is no longer a high-risk building, but demolishing it would open up extra space and the workers and equipment are already in place.

Mr. Adler suggested that staff take the suggestions made and put them into a recommendation for the committee to review and revise and send to the Executive Committee for placement on the April ORSSAB agenda.

Review Draft Recommendation on Off-site Groundwater Quality Assessment Project – Jennifer Kasten, issue manager; Carmen DeLong, assistant issue manager

The committee reviewed the revised draft recommendation on an off-site groundwater quality assessment project (Attachment 2). There was no discussion of the draft.

Ms. Sigal moved to accept the recommendation as written. Ms. Smith seconded. The committee approved the motion unanimously. The recommendation will be sent to the ORSSAB Executive Committee for review and placement on the April ORSSAB agenda.

Review Draft Recommendation on Additional Waste Disposal Capacity on the ORR – Alfreda Cook, issue manager

Ms. Cook presented a draft recommendation on Additional Waste Disposal Capacity on the Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) (Attachment 3). During discussion of the recommendation a number of revisions were made (Attachment 4).

Mr. Hemelright moved to approve the revised recommendation. Ms. Staley seconded. The committee approved the motion unanimously. The recommendation will be sent to the ORSSAB Executive Committee for review and placement on the April ORSSAB agenda.

Input on next month's topic – Presentation on Annual Remediation Effectiveness Report

None.

Review Action Items

No open action items.

New Action items

1. Staff will draft a recommendation on the FY 2016 DOE Oak Ridge Budget Request based on suggestions made during discussions at this meeting.

Public Comment

Mr. Gibson commented on the discussion of priorities and budget. He said he is more of a detail person and would have preferred more detailed suggestions on the lifecycle baseline projects.

He also said consideration of second waste disposal facility should include discussion about how close it would be to a water treatment facility.

Ms. Kasten said she had some reports that documented the presence of technetium on the ORR. She said she found the reports in response to comments board member Jimmy Bell made at the January ORSSAB meeting in which he said very little technetium was generated at ORNL and he did not think any would be found in Melton Valley. Ms. Kasten said the reports indicated that Solid Waste Storage Area 6 in Melton Valley had technetium.

The meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.

Attachments (4) are available through the ORSSAB office.

rsg